

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 4-17, and 20-23 stand rejected and claims 2, 3, 18, and 19 stand objected to. By virtue of this response, claims 2 and 18 have been cancelled, claims 1, 3, 10, 17, 19, and 21 have been amended, and no claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-17, and 19-23 are currently under consideration. Support for the amendments may be found, e.g., in the claims as originally presented; accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication or abandonment of any unclaimed subject matter by Applicants, and moreover Applicants have not acquiesced to any rejections and/or objections made by the Patent Office. Applicants explicitly reserve the right to pursue prosecution of any subject matter in continuation applications.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3, 18, and 19 stand objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 17 to include features similar to (but not identical to) dependent claims 2 and 18 respectively. Applicants submit that claims 1 and 17 (and claims depending therefrom) are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9-12, 14-17, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richmond (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,292).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for cleaning a media drive head comprising “determining a longitudinal end of data on a cleaning tape, the data associated with a previous cleaning process.” These features are similar to the features included in claim 2, which

was indicated to include allowable features in the Office Action. Claim 17 has been similarly amended to recite a media drive system configured to “determine a longitudinal end of data on the cleaning tape, the data associated with a previous cleaning process.” These features are similar to the features included in claim 18, which was indicated to include allowable features. Applicants submit that these features are not disclosed or suggested by Richmond and the rejection to claims 1 and 17 should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite a method for cleaning a media drive transducer head, the method including writing a data segment to a first portion of the cleaning tape, wherein “the data segment indicates that the second portion of the cleaning tape has been used for the cleaning process.” Thus, a data segment is written to a first portion of the cleaning tape to indicate that a second portion of the cleaning tape has been used for a cleaning process such that on subsequent loads, for example, a drive will be able to determine which portions of the cleaning tape have been previously used by reading the data segments.

Such a method is not disclosed or suggested by Richmond. Initially, Applicants note that Richmond does not disclose the use of a cleaning tape or methods for using or controlling a cleaning tape to clean a media drive transducer head. In contrast to the features of the present claims, Richmond discloses a “self-clean procedure” triggered by an error that can not be corrected by re-read or re-writes during operation. Richmond: Col. 2, lines 47-57. The “self-cleaning procedure” is described as using a standard DAT data tape in a “high-speed (e.g., X300) end-to-end tape shuttle operation in both directions which will often remove magnetic dust deposits...” Richmond: Col. 9, lines 31-34. Accordingly, the “self-cleaning procedure” uses a typical data tape and does not disclose the use of a cleaning tape or control of a cleaning tape as recited in claim 10.

Moreover, even if the tape of Richmond is taken to be a “cleaning tape” (for the sake of argument) the “Sub-Area” identified by the Examiner does not indicate a “portion of the cleaning tape that has been used in a cleaning process,” as recited by claim 10. Such features are clearly not contemplated by the “self-clean procedure” disclosed by Richmond. Accordingly, the rejection to claim 10 and claims depending therefrom should be withdrawn.

Claim 21 has been amended, similarly to claim 10, to recite a media drive configured to write a data segment to a first portion of the cleaning tape, wherein “the data segment indicates that the second portion of the cleaning tape has been used for the cleaning process.” As stated herein, Richmond does not disclose or suggest a media drive configured in such a fashion. Accordingly, the rejection to claim 21 and claims depending therefrom should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

A. Claims 5, 13, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond and Tezuka (U.S. Patent No. 4,594,617).

Claims 5, 13, and 23 depend from claims 1, 10, and 21 respectively and are allowable over Richmond for at least similar reasons as claims 1, 10, and 21. The addition of Tezuka does not cure the deficiencies of Richmond, nor is Tezuka alleged to cure the deficiencies. Accordingly, the rejection to claims 5, 13, and 23 should be withdrawn.

B. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond and Shiratori et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0169529).

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over Richmond for at least similar reasons as claim 1. The addition of Shiratori does not cure the deficiencies of Richmond, nor is Shiratori alleged to cure the deficiencies. Accordingly, the rejection to claim 8 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 249212027300. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: February 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Christopher B. Eide

Registration No.: 48,375

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

755 Page Mill Road

Palo Alto, California 94304-1018

(650) 813-5720